United Nations A/HRC/25/NI/9

General Assembly

Distr.: General
27 February 2014
English
Original: Spanish

Human Rights Council
Twenty-fifth session
Agenda item 3
Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development

Information submitted by the Network of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights of the Americas*

Note by the Secretariat

The Secretariat of the Human Rights Council transmits herewith the communication submitted by the Network of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in the Americas,** which is reproduced below pursuant to rule 7 (b) of the rules of procedure contained in the annex to Council resolution 5/1, according to which the participation of national human rights institutions shall be based on arrangements and practices agreed upon by the Commission on Human Rights, including resolution 2005/74 of 20 April 2005.

* National human rights institution with "A"-status accreditation from the International Coordination Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights.

** Reproduced in the annex as received, in the language of submission only.

GE.14-11503 (E) 040314 050314

1411503

Please recycle

Anexo

[Español únicamente]

Información presentada por la Red de Instituciones Nacionales para la Promoción y Protección de los Derechos Humanos dei Continente Americano

"La Escuela: un espacio para la paz y el buen trato. Puerto Ordaz, Venezuela, 24 de enero de 2013"

Declaración de Puerto Ordaz

El seminario internacional "La Escuela: un espacio para la paz y el buen trato. El rol de las INDH. Intercambio de buenas prácticas y experiencias", realizado en la ciudad de Puerto Ordaz, República Bolivariana de Venezuela, el 24 de enero de 2013, versó sobre la violencia escolar, sus diversas manifestaciones como la violencia entre pares, los mecanismos de prevención para la violencia escolar, así como los avances legislativos y las políticas públicas desarrolladas en la región para prevenir este fenómeno.

El seminario fue organizado, de manera conjunta, por la Defensoría del Pueblo de la República Bolivariana de Venezuela y la Secretaría General de la Red de Instituciones Nacionales de Derechos Humanos del Continente Americano, actualmente, a cargo de la Defensoría del Pueblo de la República del Ecuador.

Participaron en el Seminario las Instituciones Nacionales de Derechos Humanos de Argentina, Bolivia, Canadá, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, México, Nicaragua, Panamá y Venezuela; así como, la Oficina del Alto Comisionado de las Naciones Unidas para los Derechos Humanos (OACNUDH) y el Fondo de las Naciones Unidas para la Infancia (UNICEF).

Igualmente, participó la Presidenta del Instituto Autónomo Consejo Nacional de Derechos de Niños, Niñas y Adolescentes (IDENNA) y estuvieron presentes diversas autoridades y representantes del Sistema Rector Nacional de Protección de Niños, Niñas y Adolescentes de la República Bolivariana de Venezuela, además de la experta internacional en los derechos de los niños, niñas y adolescentes, Sonia Eljach.

Los delegados y delegadas de las INDH agradecieron a la Defensoría del Pueblo de la República Bolivariana de Venezuela por la organización del Seminario.

La Agenda de trabajo del Seminario se estructuró, luego de las palabras de apertura, en la presentación de una conferencia magistral sobre violencia escolar y cuatro paneles de discusión sobre los temas de violencia entre pares, avances legislativos en la materia y buenas prácticas e iniciativas de las INDH para la prevención de la violencia escolar.

Considerando que la Declaración Universal de los Derechos Humanos establece que un objetivo de la educación es el pleno desarrollo de la personalidad humana y el fortalecimiento del respeto a los derechos humanos y a las libertades fundamentales.

Reconociendo que la Convención sobre los Derechos del Niño acoge que la dignidad de cada persona es el principio rector fundamental de la normativa internacional de derechos humanos y que de manera especial la educación del niño deberá estar encaminada a prepararlo y prepararla para una vida responsable en la sociedad libre,

con espíritu de comprensión, paz, tolerancia, igualdad de los sexos y amistad entre la diversidad de grupos que la componen.

Recordando además que la Declaración Mundial sobre la Supervivencia, la Protección y el Desarrollo del Niño y el Plan de Acción de la Cumbre Mundial en favor de la Infancia, la Declaración del Milenio de la Naciones Unidas y la Declaración y Programa de Acción de Viena, establecen responsabilidades para que los Estados Partes a través de sus órganos garanticen el pleno desarrollo de la personalidad humana.

Tomando en cuenta que el Informe sobre "Violencia Escolar en América Latina y el Caribe: Superficie y Fondo" auspiciado por el UNICEF, pone de manifiesto que para la mayoría de los niños y niñas de la región, la escuela representa el espacio donde pasan el mayor tiempo de su vida cotidiana, siendo su función primordial: educarlos, enriquecerlos y protegerlos, en un ámbito de respeto y ejercicio de sus derechos.

Tomando en cuenta que el "Estudio Global sobre violencia contra los niños" de la Organización de las Naciones Unidas (ONU) señala que este tipo de violencia se presenta en todos los países del mundo, independientemente de las culturas, clases sociales, niveles educativos y origen étnico; que está socialmente consentida en todas las regiones y, frecuentemente, es legal y autorizada por el Estado; además, que se manifiesta en distintos ámbitos, tales como: los hogares, las familias, las comunidades y las escuelas, siendo estas últimas de medular importancia.

Considerando que la violencia escolar es inaceptable, y que prevenirla implica internalizar valores asociados a la solidaridad, la no discriminación, el respeto hacia las diferencias; y el interés superior de los niños, niñas y adolescentes; así como promover el uso de herramientas y el desarrollo de habilidades para la comunicación efectiva y el adecuado manejo de los conflictos.

Entendiendo, además, que la construcción de una cultura de paz en el ámbito escolar, pasa por crear y mantener corresponsablemente las condiciones de justicia social y el respeto de los derechos humanos.

Las Instituciones Nacionales de Derechos Humanos coincidieron en:

Que la violencia contra los niños, niñas y adolescentes, además de ser una de las formas más graves de vulneración de derechos humanos, constituye una deuda principal con las generaciones presentes y venideras.

Que la violencia escolar debe ser analizada en un contexto más amplio y en relación con los otros tipos de violencia que se expresan en la sociedad.

Que el derecho al buen trato y la prevención de la violencia es un tema de derechos humanos y debe ser abordado por las INDH de acuerdo a sus competencias, a través de diversas acciones sociales, educativas, culturales, entre otras.

Que los Estados deben promover un enfoque integral de prevención de la violencia escolar, que involucre a los niños, niñas y adolescentes como sujetos plenos de derecho, a la escuela, a la familia y a la comunidad, conforme lo establece la Doctrina de la Protección Integral.

Que los niños, niñas y adolescentes tienen la capacidad de asumir retos en la vida de modo constructivo y de participar activamente en el fomento de una cultura de paz.

Que la violencia entre pares es un fenómeno recurrente en las escuelas, de consecuencias muy graves para los niños, niñas y adolescentes, y que su práctica debe ser erradicada mediante un abordaje integral y corresponsable entre el Estado, la familia, las instituciones educativas, los medios de comunicación, y la sociedad en general.

Las Instituciones Nacionales de Derechos Humanos aprobaron el siguiente Plan de Acción:

- Promover el reconocimiento normativo del derecho al buen trato como un derecho humano inherente a la dignidad de los niños, niñas y adolescentes, el cual incluye una crianza y educación no violenta, basada en el amor, el afecto, la comprensión mutua, el respeto recíproco y la solidaridad, en la familia, la escuela y la comunidad.
- Trabajar en la modificación de patrones culturales que naturalizan la violencia como una práctica aceptable.
- Promover estrategias de formación y capacitación dirigida a los y las servidoras públicas de los sistemas educativos públicos y privados, padres, madres, representantes, responsables, familias, comunidades y niños, niñas y adolescentes para sensibilizar sobre la importancia del derecho al buen trato.
- Crear programas de participación de los niños, niñas y adolescentes para la promoción al derecho al buen trato en la familia, la escuela y la comunidad.
- Incentivar la transformación de los reglamentos escolares en pactos de convivencia construidos colectivamente con la participación de las y los estudiantes.
- Crear espacios para la mediación escolar con la participación de niños, niñas y adolescentes, fundamentados en los valores de solidaridad, respeto recíproco, igualdad para la consolidación de una cultura de paz en todos los ámbitos.
- Promover campañas de difusión masiva sobre el Derecho al Buen Trato y la Resolución pacífica de conflictos en la familia, la escuela y la comunidad.
- Desarrollar estrategias para el intercambio interinstitucional sobre experiencias de buenas prácticas sobre el Derecho al Buen Trato y la Resolución pacífica de conflictos en la familia, la escuela y la comunidad.
- Promover que los recursos socio-educativos sean medidas preferentes a la penalización, en los casos en que los niños, niñas y adolescentes estén involucrados en casos de violencia escolar.
- Impulsar investigaciones que permitan sistematizar las experiencias en la región, sobre las buenas prácticas en la promoción, educación y defensa del Derecho al Buen Trato y a la Resolución pacífica de conflictos en la familia, la escuela y la comunidad.
- Promover que los medios de comunicación usen lenguaje y programación adecuada para la formación de los niños, niñas y adolescentes, y favorecedora de una cultura de paz e igualdad

Aprobado en Puerto Ordaz, estado Bolívar, República Bolivariana de Venezuela, el 24 de enero de 2013.

Sr. Anselmo Sella

Defensor del Pueblo de la Nación de Argentina

Sr. Rolando Villena Villegas

Defensor del Estado Plurinacional de Bolivia

Sr. David Langtry

Presidente de la Comisión de los Derechos Humanos de Canadá

Sr. Jorge Armando Otálora Gómez

Defensor del Pueblo de la República de Colombia

Sra. Ofelia Taitelbaum

Defensora de los Habitantes de la República de Costa Rica

Sr. Ramiro Rivadeneira

Defensor del Pueblo de la República del Ecuador y Secretario General de la Red de INDH del Continente Americano

Sr. Aleksi Asatashvili

Coordinador de Asuntos Internacionales de México

Sr. Omar Cabezas Lacayo

Procurador para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos de Nicaragua

Sra. Patria Portugal

Defensora del Pueblo de Panamá

Sra. Gabriela del Mar Ramírez

Defensora del Pueblo de la República Bolivariana de Venezuela

United Nations A/HRC/25/NI/10

General Assembly

Distr.: General
3 March 2014

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Twenty-fifth session
Agenda item 6
Universal Periodic Review

Information presented by the Australian Human Rights Commission*

Note by the Secretariat

The Secretariat of the Human Rights Council hereby transmits the communication submitted by the Australian Human Rights Commission,** reproduced below in accordance with rule 7(b) of the rules of procedures described in the annex to Council resolution 5/1, according to which participation of national human rights institutions is to be based on arrangements and practices agreed upon by the Commission on Human Rights, including resolution 2005/74 of 20 April 2005.

* National human rights institution with "A"-status accreditation from the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights.

** Reproduced in the annex as received, in the language of submission only.

GE.14-11853

1411853

Please recycle

Annex

[English only]

Contents

	Paragraphs	*Page*
Introduction	1–7	3
1. Background and framework for promotion and protection of human rights	8–52	4
1.1 Scope of international obligations	8-10	4
1.2 National framework	11-16	5
1.3 Equality before the law and non-discrimination	17-41	6
1.4 Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers	42-47	15
1.5 Right to life, liberty and security of person	48-52	17
2. Key national priorities, initiatives and commitments	53-54	19
Appendix		20

Australian Human Rights Commission

Australia's Universal Periodic Review, 2013 Progress Report

Introduction

1. This UPR Progress Report operates as a statement of key human rights concerns and developments in Australia in 2013. The report is the third in a series of annual reports that are being developed in the lead up to Australia's second Universal Periodic Review (UPR) at the United Nations (UN) Human Rights Council in October 2015. Each report identifies important milestones as well as challenges that remain for the protection of human rights in Australia. The report is lodged with the Human Rights Council annually to provide further accountability for Australia's progress under the UPR.

2. The 2013 UPR Progress Report has been prepared by the Australian Human Rights Commission with input from the Australian Council of Human Rights Authorities (ACHRA), a body that brings together all Commonwealth, State and Territory anti-discrimination and human rights bodies.

3. Australia appeared before the Human Rights Council in 2011. 52 countries asked questions about Australia's human rights record and made 145 recommendations. The Australian Government accepted in full or in part over 90 per cent of these and also made a number of voluntary commitments to actions.

4. In June 2013 the Australian Government updated the Human Rights Council on its progress in implementing accepted recommendations prior to its next UPR appearance.[1] Australia will appear before the Human Rights Council for its second review in October-November 2015. This will involve an appraisal of implementation of existing commitments together with any additional issues which other countries participating in the process decide to raise.

5. Over the last 12 months there have been significant developments in a number of areas. ACHRA welcomes the following achievements:

- the launch of the National Action Plan on Human Rights
- the commencement of the National Disability Insurance Scheme
- the appointment of the first National Children's Commissioner.

6. Despite these positive developments, in other areas progress is lagging and much work needs to be done. The ongoing use of mandatory immigration detention and the transfer of asylum seekers to third countries for processing remains one of Australia's biggest human rights challenges. ACHRA remains concerned at the slow progress towards ratifying the *Optional Protocol on the Convention against Torture* (OPCAT), as well as lack of progress in advancing commitments made in the UPR process to review reservations to treaties.

7. This report is organised in accordance with the thematic groupings and headings that are used in the UPR reporting process.

[1] Australian Permanent Mission and Consulate-General Geneva, 'Submission of Australia's National Human Rights Action Plan 2012 constituting Australia's Universal Periodic Review mid-term report' (Media Release, 10 June 2013). At http://www.geneva.mission.gov.au/gene/statement477.html (viewed 31 October 2013).

1. Background and framework for promotion and protection of human rights

1.1 Scope of international obligations

8. During Australia's review, the Government made a commitment to improving Australia's monitoring of its international human rights obligations. Australia is a party to seven of the core human rights treaties and maintains a number of reservations under these. The Australian Government made a commitment to conduct a comprehensive review of such reservations by the end of 2012.[2] ACHRA is disappointed that there is no information available on the review process including any information on public consultation. ACHRA particularly calls for a focus on the necessity of the reservation to Art 37(c) of the *Convention on the Rights of the Child* (CRC) relating to children being held in adult detention facilities, in light of recent events in Western Australia.[3]

9. Several countries encouraged the Government to ratify the OPCAT.[4] The ratification and implementation of OPCAT is important as it will establish a national system of monitoring, ensuring that appropriate safeguards against torture exist in all places of detention. There are two sets of commitments under the OPCAT that require domestic action – legislation to enable monitoring visits of detention facilities, and the establishment of a national preventive mechanism for places of detention. It is likely that the Australian Government will avail itself of a mechanism upon ratification to delay the second of these actions for an additional time period of several years. While the commitment of the Government to work with the states and territories to implement model legislation for this first action is welcomed, ACHRA is concerned at the significant delays in implementing this longstanding commitment. It is now four and a half years since Australia signed OPCAT, with a view to taking the necessary steps to ensure Australia is in a position to ratify the treaty. ACHRA urges the government to refocus its efforts to ensure the swift ratification of OPCAT.

10. Following the release of a report by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights a series of reform proposals are currently under consideration within the UN system.[5] Of particular relevance to the Australian context is the recommendation to States Parties to establish a Standing National Reporting and Coordination Mechanism (SNRCM) for human rights treaty engagement, including reporting and follow up.[6] ACHRA encourages the Government to streamline its processes for engagement with UN human rights treaty reporting and consider establishing an SNRCM. A SNRCM would likely provide a constructive and coordinated approach, and ensure that Australia has the resources and planning in place to engage with the UN mechanisms in a timely manner.

---

[2] Attorney General's Department, *The National Human Rights Action Plan* (2012), p 7. At http://www.ag.gov.au/Consultations/Pages/NationalHumanRightsActionPlan.aspx (viewed 1 November 2013).

[3] *Wilson v Joseph Michael Francis, Minister for Corrective Services for the State of Western Australia* [2013] WASC 157.

[4] UPR Recs 1-6.

[5] N Pillay, *Strengthening the United Nations human rights treaty body system. A report by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights* (2012). At http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/HRTD/docs/HCreportonTBstrengthening210612.doc (viewed 1 November 2013).

[6] The reporting responsibilities for each of the treaties is currently split between different departments, and does not operate in the way envisaged in the High Commissioner's report.

1.2 National framework

11. The Australian Government has continued to implement a number of initiatives under the Human Rights Framework.[7] ACHRA welcomes the release of the National Human Rights Action Plan in December 2012.[8] ACHRA commends the Government for its commitment to the UPR in the Action Plan and the broad scope of issues covered in the plan. ACHRA notes that implementation to date has been slow and that many of the indicators will not be met within the agreed timeframe.

12. Throughout Australia's UPR a number of countries called for greater consolidation of Australia's anti-discrimination legislation.[9] The previous Australian Government committed to the development of a consolidated anti-discrimination law that would address the significant technical, definitional and operational differences between the four existing federal discrimination laws. A draft exposure bill was released for public comment in late 2012 however did not proceed beyond the draft exposure stage. While offering many improvements and simplifications to the existing laws, the bill met with significant public concern relating to issues including the grounds of discrimination covered, changes to the onus of proof, and the reference to behaviour that insults or offends within the definition of discrimination. ACHRA encourages the Government to consider options for reduced complexity and better consistency between the existing federal anti-discrimination laws, particularly to assist business.

13. The Parliamentary Joint Committee on Human Rights (PJCHR) has continued its role of scrutinising all Federal bills and legislative instruments to assess their compatibility with Australia's human rights obligations. The committee and process of statements of compatibility has quickly established itself as an important mechanism to implement Australia's international human rights obligations at the domestic level. Since its establishment the Committee has produced 18 reports to Parliament analysing hundreds of bills and legislative instruments and highlighting those bills which it considered raised human rights concerns. Through these reports (and also through the provision of two Practice Notes) the Committee has also provided clear guidance to government departments on their expectations about what level of human rights analysis statements of compatibility should contain. This has resulted in noticeable improvements in the quality of statements of compatibility. In 2013 the Committee's reports have included thematic examinations of three particular policy areas which were of concern to the Committee, relating to the use of civil penalty provisions, reinstatement of a system of third country processing for asylum seekers who arrive by boat to Australia, and the 'Stronger Futures' measures directed towards Aboriginal communities in the Northern Territory.

14. Human rights education must be a key priority and commitment for the Australian Government as it underpins the realisation of rights and fundamental freedoms. The Australian Human Rights Commission has led partnerships with government departments in the Australian Public Service (APS) through the APS Human Rights Officer's Network[10]

---

[7] The Human Rights Framework was launched in 2010 and sets out a range of measures to help ensure that Australia gives effect to its international human rights obligations, placing particular emphasis on education and on greater parliamentary scrutiny. See Attorney General's Department, *Australia's Human Rights Framework*, http://www.ag.gov.au/RightsAndProtections/HumanRights/HumanRightsFramework/Pages/default.aspx (viewed 1 November 2013).

[8] Attorney General's Department, *The National Human Rights Action Plan*. At http://www.ag.gov.au/Consultations/Pages/NationalHumanRightsActionPlan.aspx (viewed 1 November 2013).

[9] UPR Recs 43-46.

[10] As of July 2013, the Australian Public Service Human Rights Network has 647 members.

and training resources on human rights law and policy have been developed for the APS by the Attorney-General's Department. Since the *2012 UPR Progress Report* a number of APS Human Rights Network events have been held which addressed disability rights, the rights of older persons and constitutional recognition for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

15. The Australian Human Rights Commission has been working with the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) to mainstream human rights education in the national curricula of schools. This work ensures relevant human rights issues are appropriately included in year level requirements. In 2013, the Australian Human Rights Commission identified the resource and teacher training needs in light of human rights content in finalised national curricula, (English, history and geography) and will release information and resources aimed at human rights education in the national schools curricula this year.

16. At the state and territory level, the *Human Rights Act 2004* (ACT) will be reviewed for its ten year anniversary in 2014. While the one and five year reviews found overwhelming public support for the act, reform is still needed.[11] The addition of the right to education from 1 January 2013 is welcome, however, ACHRA is concerned that the additional ground offers far less protection than for the comprehensive civil and political rights in the Act. ACHRA proposes that the right to education be treated as a 'full right' under the Act, and the addition of other economic, social and cultural rights, such as the right to housing and health.[12] The Australian Capital Territory (ACT) Human Rights Commission has also advocated for more specific recognition for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the Human Rights Act, mirroring provisions in the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities, and reflecting the *UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*.

1.3 Equality before the law and non-discrimination

17. The unacceptable level of disadvantage experienced by **Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples** was a prominent theme during Australia's UPR. Countries called upon Australia to ensure the full and effective implementation of the *UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (the Declaration).[13] Although the Australian Government declared its support for the Declaration in 2009, to date, progress to implement has been slow. Particularly in embedding the standards enshrined in the Declaration into domestic legislative and policy making processes. ACHRA welcomes the Government's commitment to work with the Australian Human Rights Commission and the National Congress of Australia's First Peoples (Congress) to increase awareness about the Declaration and embed the principles enshrined in the Declaration in all aspects of policy design, program development and service delivery.[14] The partnership between the Commission and Congress involves the development of a National Strategy to give effect to

[11] For example, the lack of damages and the high costs of the ACT Supreme Court are additional barriers to access to justice for complainants bringing actions, and therefore there is only basic ACT jurisprudence.

[12] As recommended by the ACT Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ACT ESCR) research project led by Professor Hilary Charlesworth and Professor Andrew Byrnes. See Australian National University, *ACT economic, social and cultural rights project*, http://regnet.anu.edu.au/content/act-economic-social-and-cultural-rights-project (viewed 1 November 2013).

[13] UPR Recs 106 and 107.

[14] Joint Statement by the Australian Government and the Australian Human Rights Commission at Agenda Item 7 (Delivered at the twelfth session of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, New York, 20-31 May 2013).

the Declaration within a framework of self-determination; participation in decision making; non-discrimination and equality; and respect for and protection of culture. It also involves a series of conversations over the next 12 months with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities (and organisations) about implementation at the community level. ACHRA reiterates the need for a comprehensive implementation strategy on the Declaration and is pleased to note that government departments are increasingly referencing the Declaration as a part of this process. Despite the recent progress, ACHRA notes that the Declaration is not included in the definition of human rights in the *Human Rights (Parliamentary Scrutiny) Act 2011* (Cth)[15] nor was it included in National Human Rights Action Plan.

18. A number of countries called upon Australia to commit to the recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the Australian Constitution.[16] ACHRA welcomes the support from all Australian political parties for a referendum to change the Constitution, reflected through the passage of the *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples Recognition Act 2013* (Cth) in the Australian Parliament in March 2013. ACHRA notes that the Act provides acknowledgement of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples' unique place as Australia's first peoples[17] and prescribes that a review will be commenced considering proposals for constitutional change and their likely levels of support in the community.[18] ACHRA supports the establishment of a Joint Select Committee on Constitutional Recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples in late 2012.[19] ACHRA further notes that the Joint Select Committee was asked to consider 'the recommendations of the Expert Panel on Constitutional Recognition of Indigenous Australians on the process for the referendum.'[20] ACHRA reiterates its support for constitutional recognition and calls on the Government to reconstitute the Joint Select Committee as a matter of urgency and require that it builds on the work of the Expert Panel to ensure that the progress for a referendum does not lose momentum.

19. Countries called upon Australia to intensify efforts to reduce the life expectancy gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians and increase the commitment to reducing socio-economic inequalities.[21] As noted in the *2012 UPR Progress Report*, Australian governments continue to work in addressing socio-economic inequalities within the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population through the Closing the Gap Strategy.[22] ACHRA reiterates its support for this increased attention and government activity. ACHRA again suggests there is a need for a more holistic, integrated and coordinated approach to addressing socio-economic inequalities including health.[23]

---

[15] *Human Rights (Parliamentary Scrutiny) Act 2011* (Cth), s 3(1).

[16] UPR Recs 104, 105 and 107.

[17] *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples Recognition Act 2012* (Cth), s 3.

[18] *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples Recognition Act 2012* (Cth), s 4.

[19] Commonwealth, *Journals of the Senate: No 128, Senate*, 28 November 2012, p 3471. At http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;query=Id%3A%22chamber/journals/20121128_SJ128/0000%22 (viewed 28 October 2013).

[20] Commonwealth, *Journals of the Senate: No 128, Senate*, 28 November 2012, p 3471. At http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;query=Id%3A%22chamber/journals/20121128_SJ128/0000%22 (viewed 28 October 2013).

[21] UPR Recs 113, 115–118.

[22] Council of Australian Governments (COAG), *Closing the Gap in Indigenous Disadvantage*, http://www.coag.gov.au/closing_the_gap_in_indigenous_disadvantage (viewed 24 October 2013).

[23] See Close the Gap Campaign Steering Committee, *Building on the Close the Gap platform: Commitments for an incoming government* (2013), http://www.humanrights.gov.au/close-gap-indigenous-health-campaign (viewed 24 October 2013).

20. ACHRA supports the work of the Close the Gap Campaign for Indigenous Health Equality.[24] In July this year the Australian Government released the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Plan 2013–2023 (Health Plan).[25] The Health Plan was developed in partnership with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples including the National Health Leadership Forum.[26] The Health Plan, if effectively implemented, can drive action to achieving the goal of closing the health and life expectancy gap by 2030.[27] ACHRA commends the Australian Government on this and encourages the Government to work in partnership with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and their representatives to implement the Health Plan. ACHRA however remains concerned about ongoing and sustainable national funding. The National Partnership Agreement on Closing the Gap in Indigenous Health Outcomes expired in 2013 and whilst the Federal Government committed a further $777m over the next three years, this has not been matched by all states and territories. ACHRA calls on the Australian Government to work with state and territory governments to renegotiate this important funding agreement.

21. Concerns were also raised about the disproportionate representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders within the criminal justice system.[28] ACHRA welcomes the inclusion of the development of diversionary options for Koori women as an action item under the Victorian Aboriginal Justice Agreement 3 and the re-affirmation of this commitment by the Victorian Government in 2012. The Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission has recently completed research which confirmed the compelling need for a more comprehensive and effective approach to reducing the increasing incarceration of Koori women, noting that 80% of Koori women in Victorian prisons are mothers.[29] Accordingly, preventative and diversionary responses must be tailored to the particular needs and circumstances of these women. Work is now underway on a Koori Women's Diversion Project in that jurisdiction.

22. The issue of **equality for women and men** was raised by a number of countries. In the area of pay and employment, ACHRA welcomes the measures taken under the new *Workplace Gender Equality Act 2012* (Cth) (previously the *Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Act 1999* (Cth))[30] in particular the development of reporting matters for the gender equality indicators identified in the Act. The passing of the *Fair Work Amendment Act 2013* (Cth) in June is also a welcomed development. The Act expands the right to request a flexible working arrangement (beyond parents of children under school age and children with a disability below the age of 16 years) to parents and carers of children who are of school age or younger, as well as to carers of people with disability, people aged 55 or older and to those experiencing or supporting an immediate family or

[24] Close the Gap Campaign, *Statement of Intent*, http://www.humanrights.gov.au/publications/close-gap-indigenous-health-equality-summit-statement-intent (viewed 24 October 2013).

[25] Department of Health and Ageing, *National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Plan 2013–2023*, (2013). At http://www.health.gov.au/natsihp (viewed 24 October 2013).

[26] The national representative body for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health peak bodies.

[27] Close the Gap Campaign Steering Committee, *Building on the Close the Gap platform: Commitments for an incoming government* (2013), http://www.humanrights.gov.au/close-gap-indigenous-health-campaign (viewed 24 October 2013).

[28] UPR Recs 90, 92, 93 and 95.

[29] Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission, *Unfinished business: Koori women and the justice system (2013). At* http://www.humanrightscommission.vic.gov.au/index.php/our-projects-a-initiatives/koori-women-and-prisons *(viewed 4 November 2013).*

[30] This new legislation applies to both men and women and covers all employees and employers in the workplace. The principal objects of the Act have been amended to promote and improve gender equality in the workplace, with specific recognition of equal remuneration and family and caring responsibilities as issues that are central to improving women's participation in the workforce.

household member who is experiencing domestic/family violence. Further positive developments include the review of the National Paid Parental Leave scheme in 2013, the provision for up to two weeks of government-funded 'Dad and Partner Pay' at minimum wage (from January 2013), and funding for the development of the *Women in male-dominated industries: A Toolkit of strategies*.[31] Despite a number of initiatives being implemented in the area of pay and employment, ACHRA is concerned that the current national gender pay gap remains relatively unchanged at 17.5%,[32] while the average (mean) superannuation payouts for women is also just over half (57%) those of men.[33]

23. Australia accepted the recommendation to adopt targets of 40% of women on public boards, and agreed to work with the private sector to achieving gender balance in private sector leadership ranks and forums. ACHRA welcomes the Government's commitment to achieving a target of at least 40% women and 40% men on Australian Government boards by 2015. A recent report found that 38.4% of Government board appointments were held by women as at 30 June 2012,[34] a 3.1% increase from 2011. Since the introduction of reforms by the Australian Stock Exchange[35] the percentage of women on boards of the top 200 ASX companies has increased from 8.30% in 2010 to 16.6% in October 2013.[36] ACHRA notes that the 2012 Australian Census of Women in Leadership Census showed that only 12 ASX 500 companies have female chief executive officers and women comprise only 9.2% of executives in the ASX 500.[37]

24. Several countries raised concerns about the high level of violence against women. ACHRA welcomes the release of the first *Progress Report to the Council of Australian Governments 2010 – 2012* on the National Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children in 2013, and the commencement of the second three-year phase of the National Plan in 2014. AHCRA notes that still there remains no formal, independent monitoring or evaluation for the National Plan. In 2013, the National Centre of Excellence was formally launched, tasked with developing an evidence-base to drive policy and programs focused on reducing violence against women and their children. This new

[31] As part of the US-led multilateral initiative, the *Equal Futures Partnership To Expand Women's Political And Economic Participation*, in which Australia is a partner, the Australian Government funded the Australian Human Rights Commission to produce this online Toolkit. The Toolkit provides practical suggestions and examples of successful strategies for increasing women's representation in male-dominated industries. See Australian Human Rights Commission, *Women in male-dominated industries: A toolkit of strategies* (2013). At https://www.humanrights.gov.au/women-male-dominated-industries-toolkit-strategies (viewed 13 October 2013).

[32] Workplace Gender Equality Agency, 'The cost of being female: 64 extra days at work' (Media Release, 2 September 2013). At http://www.wgea.gov.au/news-and-media/cost-being-female-64-extra-days-work (viewed 30 October 2013). Based on the Australian Bureau of Statistics, *6302.0 – Average Weekly Earnings, Australia, May 2013*, (15 August 2013). At http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Products/6302.0~May+2013~Main+Features~Key+Figures?OpenDocument (viewed 13 October 2013).

[33] R Clare, *Developments in the level and distribution of retirement savings* (2011), p 10.

[34] The Department of Social Services. *Gender Balance on Australian Government Boards Report 2011-2012*. At http://www.dss.gov.au/our-responsibilities/women/publications-articles/gender-balance-on-australian-government-boards-report-2011-2012 (viewed 1 November 2013).

[35] The reforms required all publically listed companies in Australia to set gender diversity policies and targets and to report on their policies and targets and provide explanations if they are not in place.

[36] Australian Institute of Company Directors, *Statistics*, at http://www.companydirectors.com.au/Director-Resource-Centre/Governance-and-Director-Issues/Board-Diversity/Statistics (viewed 1 November 2013).

[37] The Workplace Gender Equality Agency, *2012 Australian Census of Women in Leadership*. At http://www.wgea.gov.au/lead/2012-australian-census-women-leadership (viewed 1 November 2013).

initiative is jointly funded by Commonwealth, State and Territory governments on a cost shared basis.

25. ACHRA notes that almost two-thirds of women affected by domestic and family violence in Australia are in some form of paid employment.[38] As discussed in the *2012 Progress Report*, ACHRA calls for the introduction of a new ground of discrimination concerning domestic and family violence, within the federal anti-discrimination legislation.[39] ACHRA commends the Government's ongoing commitment to the review of treatment of women in the Australian Defence Force and the Australian Defence Force Academy,[40] and welcomes the recent initiatives to address female genital mutilation in Australia. These include: a review of Australia's legislative framework,[41] a National Summit,[42] the establishment of a National Compact, and the provision of additional funding for projects addressing the elimination of female genital mutilation.

26. Over the last 12 months the Australian Government has undertaken a number of initiatives to strengthen its efforts to combat human trafficking. Such measures include: the adoption of the *Crimes Legislation Amendment (Slavery, Slavery-like Conditions and People Trafficking) Act 2012* (Cth);[43] the enactment of the *Crimes Legislation Amendment (Law Enforcement Integrity, Vulnerable Witness Protection and Other Measures) Act 2013* (Cth).[44] The Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade also completed its Inquiry on Slavery, Slavery-like conditions and People Trafficking, and released its finding in June 2013.[45]

---

[38] Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Personal Safety Survey 2005*, (Reissue) Catalogue No 4906.0 (2006), p 34. At www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/4906.02005%20(Reissue)?OpenDocument (viewed 10 August 2012).

[39] See Australian Human Rights Commission, *Consolidation of Commonwealth Discrimination Law: Supplementary Submission to the Attorney-General's Department* (23 January 2012). At http://humanrights.gov.au/legal/submissions/2012/20120123_consolidation.html (viewed 29 March 2012).

[40] Phase 3 of the Review of the treatment of women within the Australian Defence Force (ADF) and the Australian Defence Force Academy (ADFA), conducted by Sex Discrimination Commissioner Elizabeth Broderick is currently underway and involves an audit of the implementation of the recommendations in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 reports. The Audit Report: *Review into the Treatment of Women at the Australian Defence Force Academy* was released in 2013. The Audit Report can be accessed at: https://www.humanrights.gov.au/publications/audit-report-review-treatment-women-australian-defence-force-academy.

[41] The Attorney General's Department, *Review of Australia's Female Genital Mutilation legal framework – Final Report* (2013). At http://www.ag.gov.au/Publications/Pages/ReviewofAustraliasFemaleGenitalMutilationlegalframework-FinalReportPublicationandforms.aspx (viewed 1 November 2013).

[42] The Department of Health, *National Female Genital Mutilation Summit.* At http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/national-fgm-summit (viewed 1 November 2013).

[43] The Act recognises several additional trafficking, slavery and slavery related crimes including forced labour, forced marriage and organ trafficking.

[44] The Act extends existing vulnerable witness protections to adult victims of slavery, slavery-like and human trafficking offences, and includes specific protections for witnesses who may be vulnerable due to a particular characteristic (eg due to a disability or their cultural background). The Act also places the burden of proving the defendant was aged 18 or over on the prosecution.

[45] Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, *Trading Lives: Modern Day Human Trafficking* (2013). At http://www.aph.gov.au/parliamentary_business/committees/house_of_representatives_committees?url=jfadt/slavery_people_trafficking/report.htm (viewed 1 November 2013).

27. Over the last 12 months the Government has made progress in protecting and promoting the **rights of the child**. ACHRA welcomes the appointment of the inaugural National Children's Commissioner on 25 February 2013. The first National Children's Commissioner commenced her term on 25 March 2013. Fundamental to her role is respect for the views of children. It is therefore significant that her initial work has been to listen to the views of children and their advocates, and take them into account in deciding her priorities for action. The *Big Banter* was the listening tour that she conducted across Australia including city, rural and remote areas. The National Children's Commissioner tabled her first statutory Report to Parliament at the end of 2013. She identified five key themes arising from her listening tour. These include a right to be heard; the opportunity to thrive; the right to safety and freedom from violence; engaged civics and citizenship; action and accountability.

28. Australia appeared before the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child in June 2012, yet has delivered no formal response to the Committee's Concluding Observations.[46] ACHRA encourages the Government to respond to the Concluding Observations outlining how it intends to address each recommendation, and provide timelines and benchmarks for implementation.

29. ACHRA welcomes the Government's commitment to children's rights through its implementation of the National Framework for Protecting Australia's Children 2009–2020, the National Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children 2010–2022, and the establishment of a Royal Commission to investigate Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in January 2013.[47]

30. The Australian Government has undertaken initiatives to strengthen the **rights of older persons** in Australia. In 2013, the Government legislated to make some major reforms to the Australian aged care system.[48] This 10 year reform program aims to create a more flexible and consumer focussed system aimed at providing greater control and choice of age care services. ACHRA welcomes the consumer directed focus of the reforms and the focus on supporting and enabling people to remain independent for as long as they are able.

31. Australia has relatively low workforce participation rates amongst older people when compared with other OECD countries.[49] In 2012–13 the Australian Law Reform Commission (ALRC) conducted an inquiry into Commonwealth laws that prevent older people from participating in work. The ALRC was asked to identify any changes that could be made to Commonwealth legislation and legal frameworks to remove barriers. ACHRA

---

[46] Committee on the Rights of the Child, *Concluding Observations: Australia*, UN Doc CRC/C/AUS/CO/4 (2012). At http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/crc/crcs60.htm (viewed 19 November 2013).

[47] The Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, http://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/ (viewed 19 November 2013).

[48] Department of Health, *Living Longer Living Better* (2013). At https://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/ageing-aged-care-review-measures-living.htm (viewed 31 October 2013).

[49] In 2011, 61.1% of Australians aged 55 to 64 were participating in the workforce, more than 10 percentage points lower than New Zealand with participation rates at 73.7%. See: OECD, *How do OECD labour markets perform? Employment to population ratios, Older workers as a percentage of population aged 55-64* (2010). At http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,3746,en_2649_37457_43221014_1_1_1_37457,00.html#erate (viewed 18 June 2012). See also *Workforce participation and non-participation among baby boomers in Australia: a profile from HILDA data*, Brotherhood of St Laurence (2011), p.16. At http://www.bsl.org.au/pdfs/Gong_McNamara_Workforce_participation_and_non-participation_profile_2011.pdf (viewed 18 June 2012).

welcomes the 36 recommendations made by the inquiry.[50] A major coordinating recommendation was for the development of a National Mature Age Workforce Participation Plan.[51]

32. The previous Federal Government set up the Insurance Reform Advisory Group (IRAG) to improve insurance provisions generally. IRAG recommended that insurance limitations for older people be investigated, including the standard of data used to limit coverage. Some of the limitations apply to income protection insurance for older people. In addition to the IRAG recommendation, the ALRC recommended that the Australian Human Rights Commission develop guidance material on the insurance exception in the *Age Discrimination Act 2004* (Cth). The Age Discrimination Commissioner is currently conducting a project aimed at extending insurance coverage for older people by working with insurance stakeholders to investigate available insurance data and by providing clarity about the insurance exception in the *Age Discrimination Act 2004* (Cth). In May 2013 the Tasmanian Anti-Discrimination Commissioner concluded an investigation into the practice of insurance companies excluding or restricting insurance cover to volunteer workers on the basis of their age. ACHRA encourages the Government to consider the recommendation to develop a discrimination compliance code at the national level aimed at clarifying the way in which discrimination law applies in the provision of insurance.[52]

33. A number of countries highlighted the need for greater promotion and protection of the **rights of people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, gender diverse and intersex** (LGBTI).[53] ACHRA strongly welcomes the new protections against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status in federal anti-discrimination laws.[54] The changes commenced on 1 August 2013. The legislation also qualifies the exemptions for religious organisations to the effect that it does not apply to conduct connected with the provision of Commonwealth-funded aged care services. At the state and territory level, the Tasmanian Government has adopted changes to the *Anti-Discrimination Act 1998* (Tas) to safeguard the rights of those with diverse gender identities or who are intersex.

34. ACHRA also welcomes the Australian Government Guidelines on the Recognition of Sex and Gender.[55] The Guidelines apply across the federal government and recognise that individuals may identify and be recognised within the community as a gender other

[50] Australian Law Reform Commission, *Access All Ages—Older Workers and Commonwealth Laws* (ALRC Report 120) (2013). At http://www.alrc.gov.au/publications/access-all-ages-120-summary (viewed 31 October 2013).

[51] Other key recommendations concerned the need to harmonise and extend workers' compensation schemes so that they provide coverage for workers for as long as they remain in the workforce. The ALRC called for the abolition of compulsory retirement ages in some professions and the removal of limiting licensing or re-qualification requirements for older people. Recommendations also focussed on insurance reform and on ending age discrimination by promoting the rights and value of mature age workers. Key enablers of mature age employment are recruiters, job services providers and employers and they are the focus of many recommendations.

[52] Anti-Discrimination Commissioner Tasmania. *Volunteers, Age and Insurance: Investigation Report* (2013). At http://www.antidiscrimination.tas.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/253653/2013.05-FINAL-Investigation_Report-Insurance_and_Volunteering.pdf (viewed 6 November 2013).

[53] UPR Rec 66-70.

[54] The *Sex Discrimination Amendment (Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Intersex Status) Act 2013* (Cth) amended the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth).

[55] Attorney-General's Department, *Consultation on Australian Government Guidelines on the Recognition of Sex and Gender*, http://www.ag.gov.au/consultations/pages/AustralianGovernmentGuidelinesontheRecognitionofSexandGender.aspx (viewed 23 October 2013).

than the sex they were assigned at birth, or as an indeterminate sex and/or gender, and this should be recognised and reflected in their personal records held by Australian Government departments and agencies. ACHRA recommends that the Government should use the Guidelines as a platform for developing a nationally consistent approach to the legal recognition of sex and/or gender with state and territory governments and implement the remainder of the recommendations in the *Sex Files Report*.[56] In November 2013 the ACT Government introduced amendments to the *Births, Deaths and Marriages Act 1997* to remove discrimination against transgender and intersex persons. The amendments remove sexual reassignment surgery as a pre-requisite for change of legal sex.[57]

35. ACHRA is disappointed that the Government rejected the recommendation to amend the *Marriage Act 1961* (Cth). ACHRA is concerned that the Australian Government continues to discriminate against same-sex couples and against people with diverse sex and genders by denying them the right to marry. In October 2013 the ACT Legislative Assembly passed the *Marriage Equality (Same Sex) Act* 2013 to allow same-sex couples to marry in the ACT. This Act is currently the subject of a constitutional challenge in the High Court of Australia.

36. A number of countries made recommendations related to the ***rights of people with disability***. Following Australia's UPR the National Disability Strategy 2010–2020 (NDS)[58] was formally endorsed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2011. ACHRA notes that the NDS should play an important role in ensuring that the principles underpinning the *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* are incorporated into policies and programmes affecting people with disability, their families and their careers. ACHRA welcomes the 2010–2020 Report to COAG 2012 which incorporates the first implementation plan *Laying the Groundwork 2011–2014*.[59] ACHRA notes with concern the lack of development of performance indicators to demonstrate change over time in the six outcome areas of the NDS.

37. ACHRA applauds the Government for the commencement of the National Disability Insurance Scheme on 1 July 2013 and the referral of an inquiry into Legal Barriers for People with Disabilities to the ALRC in July 2013.[60] Consultations for the inquiry are currently taking place, and the ALRC will release its report next July.

38. ACHRA remains concerned that employment rates of people with disability have been stagnant since the passage of the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* (Cth), indicating that barriers remain which prevent people with disability from achieving full, effective, and inclusive participation in society. Overall employment rates for people with disability remain low, with labour force participation at around 54%, compared to 83% for people

[56] Australian Human Rights Commission, *Sex files: The sex and gender diversity project concluding paper* (2009). At http://www.humanrights.gov.au/sex-files-legal-recognition-concluding-paper-sex-and-gender-2009 (viewed 23 October 2013).

[57] Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Amendment Bill 2013 (ACT). At http://www.legislation.act.gov.au/b/db_48870/default.asp (viewed 29 November 2013).

[58] Department of Social Services, *National Disability Strategy 2010–2020* (2011). At http://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/05_2012/national_disability_strategy_2010_2020.pdf (viewed 23 October 2013).

[59] Department of Social Services, *Report to the Council of Australian Governments* (2012). At http://www.dss.gov.au/our-responsibilities/disability-and-carers/program-services/government-international/national-disability-strategy-2010-2020-report-to-coag-2012 (viewed 23 October 2013).

[60] Australian Law Reform Commission, *Legal Barriers for People with Disabilities*. At http://www.alrc.gov.au/inquiries/legal-barriers-people-disability (viewed 23 October 2013).

without disability.[61] There has been a consistent decline in employment levels of people with disability in the Australian Public Service over the last 20 years from 5.8% in 1992, to 3.7% in 2001, to 2.9% in 2012.[62] ACHRA is further concerned by the continuing problems facing people with physical disability in accessing public transport, including public interstate transport.

39. A number of countries expressed concern that the current legislative framework fails to protect women and children with a disability from unauthorised, non-therapeutic and forced sterilisation.[63] The Australian Human Rights Commission made a submission to the Senate Inquiry into Involuntary or Coerced Sterilisation of People with Disabilities in Australia based on the Commission's recognition that involuntary or coerced sterilisation constitutes a form of violence and violates multiple human rights.[64] The Inquiry Report, released on 17 July 2013 emphasised the importance of education and awareness-raising for people with disability, families and carers, medical practitioners and legal practitioners.[65] ACHRA welcomes the committee's recommendation that a 'best interests' test is inappropriate.[66]

40. Women with disability experience violence at significantly higher rates, more frequently, for longer, in more ways and by more perpetrators compared to women and girls without disability.[67] ACHRA notes that there is inadequate research and no national data on the prevalence and nature of such violence.[68] The National Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children does not specifically address some forms of violence experienced by women and girls with disability, for example forced sterilisation and abortion, and exploitation, neglect or violence in institutional settings. However, under the National Plan the Government has funded the Stop the violence against women with

[61] Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), *Disability Australia 2009*, 4446.0 (2011). At http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/4446.0main+features92009 (viewed 23 October 2013).

[62] Australian Public Service Commission, *Workplace Diversity Report 2000–01* (2001) p73. At http://www.apsc.gov.au/publications-and-media/print-only (viewed 23 October 2013); Australian Public Service Commission, *State of the Service Report, State of the Services Series 2011–12* (2012) p 143. At http://www.apsc.gov.au/publications-and-media/print-only (viewed 23 October 2013).

[63] UPR Rec 39.

[64] Australian Human Rights Commission, *The Involuntary or Coerced Sterilisation of People with Disabilities in Australia* (2012). At http://www.humanrights.gov.au/submissions/involuntary-or-coerced-sterilisation-people-disabilities-australia (Viewed 23 October 2013).

[65] The Senate Community Affairs References Committee. *Involuntary or Coerced Sterilisation of People with Disabilities in Australia.* (July 2013). At http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Community_Affairs/Involuntary_Sterilisation/First_Report (Viewed 23 October 2013).

[66] At the time of release the Australian Human Rights Commission welcomed the recommendations that the 'best protection of rights test' be developed and implemented, that sterilisation without consent for a person with a disability who has the capacity to consent should be banned, and that sterilisation without consent for a person with a disability who has the capacity to consent when provided with appropriate decision-making support should be banned. See Australian Human Rights Commission, 'Sterilisation: 'best interests' test is inappropriate', (Media Release, 18 July 2013). At http://www.humanrights.gov.au/news/stories/sterilisation-best-interests-test-inappropriate (viewed 6 November 2013).

[67] Women With Disabilities Australia, *Submission to the Australian Government Consultation Paper: Family Violence – Improving Legal Frameworks* (June 2010), p 6. At www.wwda.org.au/WWDASubFVL2010.pdf (viewed 31 July 2012).

[68] Women With Disabilities Australia, *Submission to the UN Analytical Study on Violence against Women With Disabilities* (December 2011), para 7. At www.wwda.org.au/WWDASubUNStudyViolenceWWDDec2011.pdf (viewed 31 July 2012).

disability and girls research project which also aligns with the National Disability Strategy 2010–2020.[69] The current draft National Disability Insurance Scheme also contains no specific measures addressed at violence against women and girls with disability.

41. ACHRA is concerned that parents with disability appear more likely to be the subject of child care and protection interventions than parents without disability, in particular, parents with cognitive impairments and mental illness. This includes intervention prior to birth where there has been no assessment of the person's capacity to parent. ACHRA remains concerned that parents of children with disabilities are driven to relinquish the care of their children to the state because they are unable to access appropriate support.[70]

1.4 Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers

42. The situation and treatment of **refugees and asylum seekers** in Australia was called into question during Australia's UPR.[71] ACHRA agrees with many of the concerns raised, and believes that more must be done to bridge the gap between Australia's human rights obligations under international law and the current treatment of asylum seekers and refugees.[72] The increased use of community arrangements for asylum seekers and refugees has been a welcomed development; however the number of people in closed detention facilities, particularly children, remains of deep concern.[73] The harmful impact of prolonged and indefinite detention on mental health is well-established. Between January 2011 and February 2013 there were 4,313 incidents of actual, threatened and attempted serious self-harm recorded in immigration detention facilities in Australia.[74]

43. ACHRA remains extremely concerned for those who have received adverse security assessment, many of whom will continue to be detained indefinitely in closed immigration detention facilities. In August 2013, the UN Human Rights Committee found that the indefinite detention of a group of 46 refugees with adverse assessments was inflicting serious psychological harm upon them, amounting to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment under article 7 of the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* (ICCPR), and was arbitrary contrary to article 9(1) of the ICCPR.[75] ACHRA welcomed the appointment of an Independent Reviewer for Adverse Security Assessments in the 2012 Progress

---

[69] Women with Disabilities Australia, People with Disability Australia and The University of NSW, *Stop the Violence*, http://www.stvp.org.au/index.htm (viewed 5 November 2013).

[70] Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission, *Desperate Measures: the relinquishment of children with disability into state care* (May 2012). At http://www.humanrightscommission.vic.gov.au/index.php/our-resources-and-publications/reports/item/153-desperate-measures-the-relinquishment-of-children-with-disability-into-state-care-in-victoria-may-2012 (viewed 27 November 2013).

[71] UPR Recs 121-134.

[72] See Australian Human Rights Commission, *Asylum seekers, refugees and human rights: Snapshot report (2013). At* http://www.humanrights.gov.au/publications/asylum-seekers-refugees-and-human-rights-snapshot-report *(viewed 1 November).*

[73] As of 30 September 2013 there were 6,403 people in immigration detention facilities, this included 1,078 children in immigration detention facilities. Department of Immigration and Border Protection, *Immigration Detention Statistics*, http://www.immi.gov.au/About/Pages/about-immigration-detention.aspx?heading=immigration-detention-and-community-statistics (viewed 1 November 2013).

[74] See Commonwealth Ombudsman, *Suicide and Self-harm in the Immigration Detention Network* (2013), p 150. At www.ombudsman.gov.au/reports/investigation/2013 (viewed 1 October 2013).

[75] Human Rights Committee, *F K A G et al v Australia*, note 65, paras 9.4 and 9.8; Human Rights Committee, *M M M et al v Australia*, Communication No. 2136/2012, UN Doc CCPR/C/108/D/2136/2012 (2013), paras 10.4 and 10.7. At www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CCPR/Pages/Jurisprudence.aspx (viewed 1 October 2013).

Report. However notes that greater transparency and accountability within the review process is still needed, and encourages the Government to consider alternative options to indefinite detention in closed facilities.

44. The transfer of asylum seekers who have arrived by boat to third countries for processing of their claims presents a number of challenges. Under international law Australia has an obligation to protect the human rights of all asylum seekers and refugees who come to Australia, regardless of their mode of arrival.[76] Australia cannot avoid its international human rights obligations by transferring asylum seekers to third countries. ACHRA is concerned that third country processing arrangements may breach a number of Australia's obligations including the principle of *non-refoulement,*[77] and other obligations related to conditions of detention, length of the detention and procedures for processing claims.[78] AHCRA notes that in June 2013 the PJCHR, having examined the legislative framework underpinning the regional processing regime, concluded that there was a significant risk that the third country processing regime was incompatible with a number of human rights.[79]

45. A number of recommendations were made to the Australian Government to enhance its efforts to address and prevent racism towards **people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.**[80] ACHRA notes with concern the growing level of racial hatred and vilification, particularly online,[81] and commends the Australian Government for its ongoing commitment to combatting racism through the National Anti-Racism Partnership. An important part of the strategy is the *Racism. It Stops with Me* campaign. More than 160 organisations have become signatories to the campaign and more than 900 individuals have signed up to the campaign as supporters. [82]

46. In June 2012, an independent panel of eminent community leaders released a report resulting from its inquiry into Australian Government services to ensure they are responsive to the needs of Australians from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. The panel's recommendations call for the strengthening of this policy, through identifying

---

[76] *1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees,* art 31.

[77] *Non-refoulement* refers to the obligation not to return a refugee to a situation where his or her life or freedom would be threatened, and not to return a person to a country where there are substantial grounds for believing that he or she would be in danger of being tortured.

[78] See Australian Human Rights Commission, *Asylum seekers, refugees and human rights: A snapshot report* (2013). At http://www.humanrights.gov.au/publications/asylum-seekers-refugees-and-human-rights-snapshot-report *(viewed 1 November).*

[79] Parliament of Australia, Parliamentary Joint Committee on Human Rights, *Ninth Report of 2013: Migration Legislation Amendment (Regional Processing and Other Measures) Act 2012 and related legislation* (2013), para 2.200. At www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint/Human_Rights/Completed_inquiries/2013/92013/index (viewed1 October 2013).

[80] UPR Recs 59, 61-65.

[81] In 2012–2013, the Australian Human Rights Commission received a total of 500 complaints under the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975* (Cth), which was a 5% increase in the number of complaints made under the Act in the previous year. 192 of the complaints were on the ground of racial hatred, which was a 59% increase from the previous year. A large quantity of the racial hatred complaints related to material on the internet. Alleged cyber-racism accounted for 41% of racial hatred complaints, which was also an increase from the previous year, where only 17% of racial hatred complaints related to internet material.

[82] Led by the Australian Human Rights Commission and comprising the Attorney-General's Department, Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, Department of Immigration and Citizenship, Australian Multicultural Council, National Congress of Australia's First Peoples and Federation of Ethnic Communities' Council of Australia.

clearer and more specific obligations that departments and agencies are required to meet.[83] There is also an expectation that the principles of access and equity will influence all government social policy areas. The Australian Government responded to the panel's recommendations in March 2013 and supported all the recommendations charged with inquiring into the responsiveness of government services to the needs of people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.[84]

47. ACHRA welcomes the release of the federal Joint Standing Committee on Migration report on the inquiry into multiculturalism in Australia in March 2013. The report affirms that multiculturalism is a success story, and stands as a good example to the world on how to build a cohesive society. [85] ACHRA encourages the Government to implement the Committee's recommendations.[86]

1.5 Right to life, liberty and security of the person Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers

48. A number of countries raised concerns in relation to the Australian criminal justice system. ACHRA notes with concern that children under 18 years have been transferred from youth justice facilities to adult prisons in a number of jurisdictions including Victoria and Western Australia. In 2013, the Australian Human Rights Commission was granted leave to intervene in proceedings in the Supreme Court of Western Australia in a matter concerning the transfer of children from the Banksia Hill Detention Centre to Hakea Prison, which is an adult facility in Western Australia.87 As at 10 October 2013, the Western Australian Department of Corrective Services reported that 58 juveniles remained at Hakea Prison.[88]

49. ACHRA urges State Governments to review incarceration practices to ensure that vulnerable young people are protected. ACHRA recommends that there must be greater focus on reinvestment, in addition to a greater focus on evidence based practice. ACHRA welcomes the Victorian review of the policy and procedures governing such transfers to improve compliance with international obligations, and the *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006* (Vic), but reiterates that the placement of children in solitary

---

[83] See Australian Human Rights Commission, 'Statement by Race Discrimination Commissioner welcoming the recommendations of the Access and Equity Inquiry Panel' (Media Release, 5 July 2012). At https://www.humanrights.gov.au/news/media-releases/statement-race-discrimination-commissioner-welcoming-recommendations-access-and (viewed 23 October 2013).

[84] See Australian Government, *Government Response to the Recommendations of the Access and Equity Inquiry* (2013). At http://www.immi.gov.au/living-in-australia/a-multicultural-australia/government-approach/government-services/multicultural-access-and-equity.htm (viewed 23 October 2013).

[85] See Parliament of Australia, House of Representative Committees, *Inquiry into Multiculturalism in Australia*. At http://www.aph.gov.au/parliamentary_business/committees/house_of_representatives_committees?url=mig/multiculturalism/media.htm (viewed 23 October 2013).

[86] Recommendations include: supporting the National Anti-Racism Strategy; rebuilding Australia's research capacity in this field, especially in qualitative research; factoring cultural and linguistic diversity into the Government's Social Inclusion Agenda; having greater flexibility in English language training and support for micro enterprises, especially for women.

[87] Australian Human Rights Commission, 'Commission seeks to intervene in juvenile detention case' (Media Release, 10 April 2013). At http://www.humanrights.gov.au/news/stories/commission-seeks-intervene-juvenile-detention-case (viewed 11 November 2013).

[88] Government of Western Australia, Department of Corrective Services, *Weekly Offender Statistics (WOS) Report as at 10 October 2013 00.00 hours*, p 3. At http://www.correctiveservices.wa.gov.au/_files/about-us/statistics-publications/statistics/2013/cnt131010.pdf (viewed 22 October 2013).

confinement in adult prison may amount to degrading treatment and is inconsistent with Australia's obligations under the CRC and ICCPR.

50. ACHRA is also concerned about the current 'doli incapax' common law rule of criminal responsibility and would prefer to see the age raised to 12 years of age, as other reviews have recommended.[89]

51. The issue of policing was raised during Australia's review.[90] In Victoria there have been community concerns about police interaction with young people and allegations of racial profiling.[91] ACHRA welcomes Victoria Police's community consultation on its field contact policy and cross-cultural awareness training.[92]

52. ACHRA has significant concerns about the effects of a number of laws passed by Queensland and Western Australian parliaments in October 2013 to curtail criminal activity among bikie gangs throughout the state in that they may breach Australia's obligations under the ICCPR.[93]

2. Key national priorities, initiatives and commitments

53. The Paris Principles set out the minimum standards required by national human rights institutions to be considered credible and to operate effectively.[94] In order to be effective and granted an 'A status', national human rights institutions must be independent, adequately funded and have a broad human rights mandate. ACHRA encourages the new Government to ensure that the Australian Human Rights Commission receives adequate core funding through the regular federal budget process. ACHRA further notes that the Commission's functions could be enhanced, through legislative amendment, to provide a clearer focus on individual liberties, fundamental freedoms and human rights reflected in the common law.

54. As Australia moves into the second half of its UPR cycle, ACHRA encourages the Government to continue its commitment to the UPR process and employ the same level of consultation and engagement with civil society and the Australian Human Rights Commission in the lead up to the next appearance in October – November 2015.

---

[89] For example, the ACT Human Rights Office, Human Rights and Discrimination Commissioner, *Human Rights Audit of Quamby Youth Detention Centre* (2005). At http://www.hrc.act.gov.au/res/Quamby%20Audit-final%2030%20June%202005_.doc (viewed 4 November 2013); ACT Children & Young People Commissioner and the Human Rights & Discrimination Commission. *ACT Youth Justice System 2011: A Report to the ACT Legislative Assembly by the ACT Human Rights Commission.* At http://www.hrc.act.gov.au/content.php/content.view/id/251 (viewed 29 November 2013).

[90] UPR recs 88, 95 and 96.

[91] S Donovan, 'Victoria Police settles racial profiling case,' *ABC News*, 18 Feb 2013. http://www.abc.net.au/news/2013-02-18/police-agree-to-new-procedures-to-combat-racism/4524770 (viewed 11 November 2013).

[92] Victoria Police, *Community Consultation,* http://www.police.vic.gov.au/content.asp?Document_ID=39350 (viewed 12 November 2013).

[93] *Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Act 2013 (QLD), Tattoo Parlours Act 2013* (QLD), *Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) Amendment Act 2013 (QLD).*

[94] Principles relating to the Status of National Institutions (The Paris Principles) adopted by UN General Assembly, *National institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights,* UN Doc A/RES/48/134 (20 December 1993).

Appendix

Calendar of upcoming key UN treaty dates

Treaty	*Key Dates*
Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)	Australia to appear before the committee in May 2012
Convention Against Torture (CAT)	Next report due 2012
Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)	Australia likely to appear before the committee in 2012
Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD)	Next report due 2012
International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)	Next report due 2013
International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)	Next report due 2014
Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)	Next report due 2014

United Nations A/HRC/25/NI/11

General Assembly

Distr.: General
28 February 2014

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Twenty-fifth session
Agenda item 6
Universal Periodic Review

Information presented by the Irish Human Rights Commission*

Note by the Secretariat

The Secretariat of the Human Rights Council hereby transmits the communication submitted by the Irish Human Rights Commission,** reproduced below in accordance with rule 7(b) of the rules of procedures described in the annex to Council resolution 5/1, according to which participation of national human rights institutions is to be based on arrangements and practices agreed upon by the Commission on Human Rights, including resolution 2005/74 of 20 April 2005.

* National human rights institution with "A"-status accreditation from the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights.

** Reproduced in the annex as received, in the language of submission only.

GE.14-11860

1411860

Please recycle

Annex

[English only]

Introduction

1. The Irish Human Rights Commission (IHRC) is Ireland's National Human Rights Institution (NHRI), set up by the Irish Government under the Human Rights Commission Acts 2000 and 2001.[1] The IHRC has a statutory remit under the Human Rights Commission Act 2000 to endeavour to ensure that the human rights of persons in the State are fully realised and protected in the law and policy of the State. The IHRC enjoys 'A' Status Accreditation with the International Coordinating Committee of NHRIs.

2. In 2010, the IHRC undertook a review of Ireland's human rights record in advance of the State's first periodic report to the Human Rights Council under the Universal Periodic Review ("UPR") process. In preparation of its shadow report, the IHRC engaged in consultations with Civil Society in Ireland including at regional briefings outside of Dublin to support stakeholders to make their reports. The IHRC made a submission for the Twelfth Session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, when Ireland was examined in March 2011. This follow-up submission marks the mid-term review of Ireland's four and a half year UPR cycle. It aims at providing a snapshot on the State's progress in implementing UPR recommendations under a number of priority themes.

3. Later in 2014 it is expected that the IHRC will formally merge with its sister body the Equality Authority to form the new Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission. This is a new body being established with the purpose of strengthening efforts to promote and protect human rights and equality in Ireland. The publication of legislation to formally establish the body is expected in early 2014.

4. The IHRC is pleased to have the opportunity to provide this short submission to the Council. As a member of the Council, the State has continuously stressed its commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights.

Issues

a) **Issue 1 – Ratification by the State and Incorporation of International Human Rights Conventions into Domestic Law (Recommendations 106.1 - 106.6, 106.9- 106.11)**

- The State has not yet ratified a number of the instruments it undertook to ratify in 2011.
- The State has sought to introduce one limited constitutional amendment, to provide for enhanced children's rights, in respect to Article 19 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (presently under legal challenge).
- The State has established a Constitutional Convention but not formally referred the matter of the incorporation of ratified treaty rights into domestic law for its consideration.

[1] For detailed information on the work of the IHRC, *see* www.ihrc.ie.

b) Issue 2 – Human Rights and Equality Infrastructure (Recommendations 106.7, 106.8, 106.12, 106.13)

- In May 2012, the State published the General Scheme of the Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission Bill 2012 and the follow-up draft Bill is expected imminently.
- In the interim, both the Equality Authority and Irish Human Rights Commission continue as separate legal entities under the interim auspices of Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission (IHREC) designate.
- In December 2013, the IHREC designate was provided with an enhanced cumulative budget and permission to recruit additional staff.
- The State needs to ensure that in the context of the merger of the Labour Court, Labour Relations Commission, Employment Appeals Tribunal, National Employment Rights Authority and Equality Tribunal that the protection and complaints resolution process, under the Equal Status Acts 2000-2011, is not weakened or made any less accessible.

c) Issue 3 – Human Rights Education and Training (Recommendations 106.14, 107.24)

- The IHRC continues to provide free human rights education and training to limited groups of civil and public civil servants and there remains a pressing need for human rights education and training for Civil Servants to be more fully resourced by the State.

d) Issue 4 – Equality (Recommendations 106.20, 106.21, 107.14, 107.57, 107.59)

- Article 41.2 of the Irish Constitution continues to perpetuate stereotypical attitudes towards the role of women in Irish society and is a matter of priority and a specified timeframe for its replacement or amendment needs to be put in place.[2]
- The State still needs to expand the definition of equality in Irish law. In particular, Article 40.1 of the Constitution should be amended to guarantee equality to all and to proscribe discrimination (direct or indirect) in any area of law and practice on non-exhaustive grounds.[3]

e) Issue 5 – Travellers (Recommendations 106.30-106.33, 107.31-107.33)

- The State has not recognised Travellers as an ethnic minority.
- There is a lack of adequate, good quality accommodation provided to Travellers by Local Authorities, which in part arises from the non-recognition of Travellers as an ethnic group, insofar as their traditional nomadism is not recognised.[4]

---

[2] It is noted that this Article is under consideration by the Constitutional Convention.

[3] See https://www.constitution.ie/AttachmentDownload.ashx?mid=cee1b183-0b79-e211-a5a0-005056a32ee4 Article 40.1 provides "All citizens shall, as human persons, be held equal before the law. This shall not be held to mean that the State shall not in its enactments have due regard to differences of capacity, physical and moral, and of social function." *See also* IHRC Submission to the Irish Government in preparation of Ireland's Sixth Periodic Report to the UN CEDAW Committee, 2008, p. 5 www.ihrc.ie/download/pdf/submission_cedaw.pdf; IHRC Submission to the UN Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women in respect of Ireland's Combined Fourth and Fifth Periodic Reports under the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women, 2005, p. 17. www.ihrc.ie/download/pdf/submission_cedaw.pdf

[4] IHRC Submission for the Twelfth Session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Ireland, March 2011, para 31. Available at: http://www.ihrc.ie/download/pdf/ihrc_report_to_un_universal_periodic_review_march_2011.pdf

- Since 2000, there have only been 47 units of transient accommodation provided for nomadic Travellers across the country, with no new unit being provided since 2008.[5]At the same time Travellers are subjected to draconian laws that allow for their summary removal from unofficial sites,[6] the results being that Travellers ability to maintain a nomadic or semi-nomadic way of life is diminished.[7]

f) Issue 6 - National Action Plans (Recommendations 107.25, 107.26)

- The State has not introduced a National Action Plan for Human Rights to mainstream human rights into Irish law, policy and practice. It is noted that it is proposed in the context of the IHREC Bill that there will be a positive duty on public bodies to take account of human rights and equality.
- There is also no progress in developing a National Action Plan for Human Rights Education and Training in line with the World Programme on Human Rights Education.
- An updated National Action Plan Against Racism (2005 – 2008) has yet to be produced.

g) Issue 7 – Prisoners (Recommendations 106.36 – 106.48)

- The State has taken steps to improve prisoner conditions including the basic training of Prison Officers in human rights in conjunction with the IHRC. However it has yet to fully end the practice of 'slopping-out'.
- Although the Inspector of Prisons' mandate has been expanded, the State has yet to take steps towards the ratification of OPCAT and establishment or designation of a National Preventative Mechanism that meets the Paris Principles requirements of independence, expertise and resources to ensure oversight of places of detention in Ireland.
- There is still a failure to fully separate sentenced and remand prisoners.
- An independent Prisoner Ombudsman is still to be established to investigate individual complaints made by prisoners in relation to their treatment while in prison.

h) Issue 8 - Migrant Workers and Protection of Minority Rights (Recommendations 106.22, 106.34, 54, 60, 61, 107.13, 108.1)

- The State has not taken steps to promote the participation of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups in the workforce, such as migrant workers, including by reforming the work permit system to incorporate freedom to change employers and providing temporary work permits to asylum seekers.
- The State has not introduced stand-alone legislation, to combat Human Trafficking, that defines forced or compulsory labour and servitude as a criminal offence in its own right, and in addition confers a specific mandate on the National Employment Rights Agency to include the detection and prosecution of such offences within their inspection and regulatory powers.

---

[5] Figures published by the Department of Environment, Community and Local Government, 2013. See, http://www.environ.ie/en/Publications/StatisticsandRegularPublications/HousingStatistics/

[6] See for instance, section 10, Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1992 (as amended), and section 24 of the Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 2002.

[7] See IHRC Submission to the UN Human Rights Committee on Ireland's Fourth Periodic Report under the ICCPR – List of Issues Stage, August 2013.

- To combat Trafficking, victims of forced or compulsory labour and servitude should have the opportunity to seek redress through civil law, whatever their legal status in the State, and be provided with appropriate protection by the State.[8]

i) Issue 9 - Violence Against Women (Recommendations 106.49 -53, 107.36-40)

- The State has not ratified the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating violence against Women and Domestic Violence and in this context has not provided adequate resources for domestic violence services

j) Issue 10- Abortion (Recommendations 108.5, 108.6, 108.7, 108.8, 108.9)

- The Oireachtas (Parliament) passed the Protection of Life During Pregnancy Act, in July 2013, and the Act was commenced in January 2014. This legislation was in response to the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in A, B, and C v Ireland.[9] The matter of execution of this judgment is still under consideration by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe.

---

[8] IHRC Follow Up Report on the State Involvement with Magdalen Laundries, June 2013, at p. 127.
[9] *A, B and C v Ireland*, Grand Chamber, Judgment 16 December 2010.

United Nations A/HRC/25/NI/12

General Assembly

Distr.: General
28 February 2014

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Twenty-fifth session
Agenda item 3
Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development

Information presented by the National Human Rights Commission of Korea*

Note by the Secretariat

The Secretariat of the Human Rights Council hereby transmits the communication submitted by the National Human Rights Commission of Korea,** reproduced below in accordance with rule 7(b) of the rules of procedures described in the annex to Council resolution 5/1, according to which participation of national human rights institutions is to be based on arrangements and practices agreed upon by the Commission on Human Rights, including resolution 2005/74 of 20 April 2005.

* National human rights institution with "A"-status accreditation from the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights.

** Reproduced in the annex as received, in the language of submission only.

Annex

[English only]

Contents

		Paragraphs	*Page*
I.	Introduction	1–2	3
II.	Position of the NHRCK on the Report of the Special Rapporteur	3–7	3
	A. Functional Autonomy (para. 57)	3-4	3
	B. Processing of Complaints (para. 59)	5	3
	C. Sit-in Demonstration by Disability-rights Defenders (paras. 60, 61)	6-7	4
III.	Conclusion	8-11	4
	Appendix		5

I. Introduction

1. The National Human Rights Commission of Korea (hereinafter "NHRCK") welcomes the positive assessment given in the report by the Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights Defenders (hereinafter "Special Rapporteur") on the efforts of the NHRCK for the consolidation of democracy in the Republic of Korea; its important role in the establishment of a solid human rights institutional framework; and for its commitment to public education campaigns. Also, the NHRCK sincerely recognizes the endeavor made by the Special Rapporteur to clearly understand the situation of human rights in the Republic of Korea as she considered the views of various groups and sectors of the society during her mission to the Republic of Korea.

2. However, the NHRCK is compelled to provide additional explanation on certain points as follows.

II. Position of the NHRCK on the Report of the Special Rapporteur

A. On the concern that the NHRCK lacks functional autonomy (Paragraph 57)

3. Functional autonomy of the NHRCK is ensured by the National Human Rights Commission Act. In fact, the NHRCK is carrying out its mandates without any intervention from the Government. However, if the Government cuts human and financial resources, the work of the NHRCK may be undermined. This requires certain measures to strengthen autonomy of the NHRCK.

4. Also, with regard to the appointment of the Chairperson, the National Human Rights Commission Act has been amended on 21 March 2012 to increase transparency of the appointment process of the Chairperson by requiring the Chairperson-appointee to stand before a hearing at the National Assembly. In fact, the current Chairperson was appointed after passing the confirmation hearing on 16 July 2012.

B. On the concern of excessive delays of processing complaints submitted by activists (Paragraph 59)

5. The report of the Special Rapporteur claimed that the NHRCK unduly dismissed or overruled complaints submitted by human rights defenders and excessively delayed giving decisions on such petitions. However, the NHRCK did not process the complaints by human rights defenders differently from other complaints in a discriminative manner. Rather, the NHRCK dismissed and rejected complaints fairly, only in strict accordance to the National Human Rights Commission Act. The delays in processing complaints were due to the annual increase in the number of complaints despite staff reduction by 21% (44 persons) in 2009. In 2010 in particular, collective complaints in relation to persons with disabilities were received as a result of the enforcement of the Anti-Discrimination against and Remedies for Persons with Disabilities Act, adding on to the issue of delayed processing of complaints. Nevertheless, consistent effort of the NHRCK has cut down the average duration of processing complaints to 96 days in 2013, from 135 days in 2012. (See Attachment)

C. On the concern of sit-in demonstration staged by disability-rights defenders (Paragraphs 60, 61)

6. The NHRCK recognizes the fact that it consistently made requests to the members of disability organizations and activists to leave its premises. However, such requests were made because they staged a sit-in protest in office areas of the NHRCK, severely obstructing the work of the NHRCK; because the protesters used physical power against several staff members of the NHRCK, incurring physical injuries; and because they inflicted damages to the property. In the duration of the sit-in protest, the NHRCK did not in any manner suspend electric power or heating, or restrict entry of food. In the case of heating, the NHRCK does not have any access to control the heating system, because the NHRCK has been renting only some parts of the building, with a separate and unrelated company being responsible for managing overall system of the building. In addition, it needs noting that partial restriction of the access of activists to prevent diffusion of the sit-in protest was inevitable, since staging a sit-in protest in the office area of a State organ is an illegal act.

7. According to the media, the late activist was a disabled person with first-degree brain lesion who on 2 December 2010 was participating in the sit-in protest at the NHRCK calling for enactment of the Act on Support for Activities of Persons with Disabilities when he was taken on an ambulance and was hospitalized, after which he was in recovery. However, he reportedly participated in another sit-in protest on the road in front of the National Assembly on 8 December 2010, when his health quickly deteriorated, resulting in pneumonia that led to his death on 2 January 2011.

III. Conclusion

8. In addition to the performances listed by the report, the NHRCK is active in the field of Information and Communications Technology (hereinafter "ICT") and Human Rights, publishing "the Report on ICT and Human Rights" in January 2013. Also, the NHRCK strives in the field of Business and Human Rights, publishing a final report on "the On-site Investigation on Human Rights Violations by Korean Firms in Foreign Operations and Research to Improve Legal Institutions" in October 2013, as well as the "Report on Business and Human Rights" in February 2013. Moreover, the NHRCK is active in the field of North Korean human rights, publishing the "Compilation of North Korean Human Rights Violation Cases" in March 2012 and holding "Seoul International Symposium on North Korean Human Rights" in April 2013.

9. The NHRCK welcomes the positive assessment by the Special Rapporteur on the efforts of the NHRCK in promoting and protecting human rights in the Republic of Korea. As recommended by the Special Rapporteur, the NHRCK will make unyielding efforts to strengthen its independence and enhance cooperation with human rights defenders. Also, the NHRCK will closely work with the International Human Rights System including the Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights Defenders.

Appendix

Additional Comments on Complaint Dismissal/Rejection

On "undue dismissal and rejection" of complaints

- Difficulties arise with increase in complaints while staff is being reduced or kept
- Unilateral Government measures to reduce the organization in 2009 led to reduction in the number of investigative officers while incoming and processing load of complaints increased every year. Nevertheless, by empowering investigative officers through professional training programs and actively recruiting investigators, functional capacity of the NHRCK has recovered the level before the staff reduction took place.

Despite recovery from staff reduction, steady increase in the number of complaints is adding on to the difficulties of processing complaints.

Table 1

Number of complaints Registered and Processed in the last Three Years

Year	Registered Complaints	Processed Complaints
2011	7,357	7,093
2012	9,582	9,587
2013	10,050	10,427

Table 2

Size of Staff, Investigative Officers, and Annual number of Processed Cases in the last Five Years

Categories	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Staff (Investigators)	208(61)	164(43)	164(50)	185(49)	187(66)	188(65)
Processed Cases	6,466	6,788	8,393	7,093	9,587	10,427

Matters subject to investigation by the NHRCK are limited by legislation. Even if a case is within the purview of the NHRCK, rate of dismissal and rejection is high due to difficulties in finding evidence.

- However, cases that were withdrawn upon their resolution during investigation process and cases which does not require a separate remedy are also included in the number of cases dismissed or rejected.

Table 3

Decisions on Complaints (as of December 2013, unit: case)

Total	Recommendation	Dismissed (Resolved during Investigation)	Rejected (Resolved during Investigation)	Transferred/ Investigation Aborted	Total
75,840	4,503	22,238(1,993)	47,452(5,910)	1,647	75,840

Representative cases among cases dismissed or rejected which are resolved during investigation process

- The Dismissed Complaint on the Provision of Emergency Remedy to Kim Jinsook of the Korean Confederation of Trade Unions (KCTU)> concerns with Kim Jinsook who had been staging a 309-day sit-in protest in a tower crane No. 85 of Hanjin Heavy Industries Co. in the period from 6 January 2011 to 10 November 2011. On 28 June 2011, emergency remedy was requested from the NHRCK to recommend allowing entry of food, water, and undergarments. Immediately following such request, the NHRCK dispatched investigative officers to the site to conduct preliminary investigation and mediate between the Parties involved, resulting in the settlement of the case. Therefore, the Sub-Committee with relevant jurisdiction dismissed the case based on Article 39.1.3 (In the case it is deemed that any further remedy is not required) of the National Human Rights Commission Act.
- The Withdrawn Complaint on the Restriction imposed on entry of Water for protesters> involves Pastor C who was engaged in an one-man demonstration in front of the Daehan Gate at 09:00 on 14 June 2013 calling for reinstatement of laid-off workers at Ssangyong Motors Co. The police denied entry of water intended for the pastor, based on which an emergency remedy was requested to the NHRCK. The NHRCK dispatched investigative officers to the site to demand correction to the police, which led to allow entry of water. As such, the case was rejected as the petitioner withdrew his complaint upon settlement of the matter.
- The Withdrawn Complaint on the Provision of Emergency Remedy to the Citizens' Committee against the Construction of Miryang Power Transmission Tower> involves cases of human rights violations, including restraint by the police, during the process of moving the incense altar for late Ms. Y, who passed away after taking poison as a sign of protest against the construction of the power transmission tower, to Miryang City Hall at 15:00 on 27 January 2014. The complaint was submitted by the Secretary-General of the Citizens' Committee against the Construction of Miryang Power Transmission Tower, upon which the NHRCK dispatched investigative officers to the site on the day the complaint was received. As a result of preliminary investigations and mediation by the investigative officers, the petitioner and the police reached a settlement by agreeing to install the incense altar at a third location. With the matter settled, the petitioner retracted the complaint, based on which the case was withdrawn and therefore rejected.

Measures taken by the NHRCK on Human Rights Violations concerning cases of Jeju Naval Base and Miryang Power Transmission Tower

- The Case concerning Protest against the Construction of a Naval Base in Gangjung Village (Jeju Island> involves sending investigators to the site four times to monitor the situation regarding human rights violation on 1~3 September 2011. Upon two occasions of receiving requests for emergency remedy on 27 February 2012 and 7

March respectively, an investigator was dispatched to the site, reaching settlements on the case. The result of the investigation on the cases of human rights violations in Gangjung Village led to recognize 8 cases which revealed acts of human rights violations by the police. Accordingly, the NHRCK delivered Recommendations for Corrections, with a number of cases currently being under investigation.

- The Case concerning the Protests against the Construction of Miryang Power Transmission Tower> involves the NHRCK organizing and dispatching Human Rights Guardians on two occasions (20~21 May 2013 and 1~2 October 2013) to monitor acts of human rights violations on-site. Since 7 October 2013, on-site monitoring had been conducted for more than once or twice each week. Also, as of 12 February 2014, total of 16 cases of complaints have been received, based on which on-site investigation have been conducted 8 times. On the case of undue restriction of movement, the NHRCK delivered a statement based on Article 25 of the National Human Rights Commission Act. Moreover, cases of emergency remedy concerning protection of protesters at the construction site of the transmission tower, and the installation of incense altar for late Ms. Y who took poison during protest against construction of the tower have been resolved on-site. The NHRCK seeks to make a decision upon the allegations of human rights violations through swift investigation on cases that are currently being processed.

United Nations A/HRC/25/NI/13

General Assembly

Distr.: General
27 February 2014

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Twenty-fifth session
Agenda item 3
Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development

Information presented by the Scottish Human Rights Commission *

Note by the Secretariat

The Secretariat of the Human Rights Council hereby transmits the communication submitted by the Scottish Human Rights Commission**, reproduced below in accordance with rule 7(b) of the rules of procedures described in the annex to Council resolution 5/1, according to which participation of national human rights institutions is to be based on arrangements and practices agreed upon by the Commission on Human Rights, including resolution 2005/74 of 20 April 2005.

* National human rights institution with "A"-status accreditation from the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights.

** Reproduced in the annex as received, in the language of submission only.

GE.14-11510

1411510

Please recycle

Annex

[English only]

Information presented by the Scottish Human Rights Commission on the Report of the Independent Expert on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment

Mr. President,

Distinguished delegates,

The Scottish Human Rights Commission (SHRC) notes with appreciation the report of the Independent Expert on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment. The Commission welcomes the focus on identifying the legal and institutional framework that States have to adopt in order to protect individuals against environmental harm which interferes with the enjoyment of human rights.

As an independent national human rights institution with a broad mandate to promote and protect human rights, SHRC is uniquely positioned to hold States accountable, to monitor developments and offer constructive advice and guidance on appropriate measures to support and strengthen environmental policy making at national level.

SHRC welcomes the Special Rapporteur's emphasis on policy making, the connections between substantive and procedural rights, the impact on vulnerable groups and the relationship between human rights obligations and best practices. The Independent Expert's report timely covers the especially pressing environmental chalienges that we face today, including climate change. The Commission recognises the need to integrate these issues into both domestic policy and practice.

To this end, the Commission has led the development of Scotland's first National Action Plan for Human Rights which will help bring about a consistent process for integration of relevant human rights standards in Scotland's climate change policy and practice.

Scotland has taken a number of steps in this area including the creation of a Climate Justice Fund which has supported water projects in Malawi and Zambia, and also what is understood to be the world's first unanimous Parliamentary motion on Climate Justice. This motion recognises the intrinsic linkages between human rights, development and climate change. Scotland's National Action Plan will build on these commitments and ensure that Scotland plays a key role in sharing with other countries its own experience of putting people and human rights at the heart of climate policy.

The Commission looks forward to closely collaborating and providing any further information on these issues to the Independent Expert and the Council.

United Nations A/HRC/25/NI/14

General Assembly

Distr.: General
27 February 2014

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Twenty-fifth session
Agenda item 3
Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development

Information presented by the Scottish Human Rights Commission *

Note by the Secretariat

The Secretariat of the Human Rights Council hereby transmits the communication submitted by the Scottish Human Rights Commission**, reproduced below in accordance with rule 7(b) of the rules of procedures described in the annex to Council resolution 5/1, according to which participation of national human rights institutions is to be based on arrangements and practices agreed upon by the Commission on Human Rights, including resolution 2005/74 of 20 April 2005.

* National human rights institution with "A"-status accreditation from the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights.

** Reproduced in the annex as received, in the language of submission only.

GE.14-11517

1411517

Please recycle

Annex

[English only]

Information presented by the Scottish Human Rights Commission on the Annual full-day meeting on the rights of the child (HRC res. 22/32)

Mr. President,

Distinguished delegates,

The Scottish Human Rights Commission welcomes this discussion. Following our four year research project into the human rights situation in Scotland, we identified enhancing respect, protection and fulfilment of human rights to achieve justice and safety for all as one of our key priorities.

Scotland has a unique system for addressing the needs of children who commit offences through its welfare based children's hearing system, placing the best interest of the child at the centre of decision making and also giving life to the right to respect for the views of the child. However, we also have one of the lowest ages of criminal responsibility in the world at just eight years. Early intervention to prevent offending should be increased, as should alternatives to detention for children.

Children still face barriers in terms of accessing legal advice, including costs and choice of representation. The impact of austerity measures, in particular welfare reform and legal aid cuts are disproportionately affecting children.

More must be done to protect children in Scotland from violence, including repealing the defence of "justifiable assault", enhancing parenting support and improving child protection measures.

We hope that Scotland will address these issues through Scotland's first National Action Plan for Human Rights which was launched on 10 December 2013. We look forward to assessing how much progress has been made at the UK's UPR mid-term report later this year.

Annex

[English only]

Joint statement submitted by the Equality and Human Rights Commission, the Scottish Human Rights Commission and the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission (A Status NHRIs of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)

Title: Adoption of the Report of the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context – Mission to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Mr President,

I welcome the opportunity to present this statement in response to the report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to adequate housing on her mission to the UK. I make this statement in the name of the Equality and Human Rights Commission, the Scottish Human Rights Commission and the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission, the United Kingdom's three A status national human rights institutions.

We welcome the Special Rapporteur's report and thank her for her visit to the UK. In her report the Special Rapporteur highlights UK-wide concerns but also recognises the relevance of devolution in relation to law, policy and decision-making in the area of adequate housing. The UK's NHRIs supported the Special Rapporteur's mission with EHRC hosting a meeting with stakeholders, SHRC organising roundtables with civil society organisations and NIHRC facilitating a process of continuous engagement between local NGOs and the Special Rapporteur.

We acknowledge the Special Rapporteur's analysis of the impact of austerity measures, in particular Welfare Reform. All three NHRIs have worked on a range of concerns, including with respect to under-occupancy rules and limits to housing benefit, which can disproportionately affect the most vulnerable members of society.

The Special Rapporteur also highlights the need to ensure the availability of appropriate and culturally sensitive accommodation options for Gypsy and Traveller communities across the United Kingdom. This is also an issue which UK NHRIs have raised in each of our jurisdictions. In addition, the report raises concerns regarding the particular situation in Northern Ireland, where equality and choice in accessing social housing remains constrained by the persistence of community divisions.

The Special Rapporteur's report is a very timely contribution to addressing the need for a sufficient and adequate supply of housing in times of austerity. The UK's NHRIs will follow up on her recommendations in our ongoing work, including through the UPR mid-term report. In Scotland the National Action Plan for Human Rights will constitute the primary mechanism for implementation.

We call upon Government to carry out full assessments and evaluations as recommended by the Special Rapporteur; to ensure, prior to implementation, that new regulations do not discriminate unlawfully; and, that they protect the right to an adequate standard of living.

We look forward, Mr President, to considering her recommendations in our future work and to further cooperation with the Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council.

Annexe

[Français seulement]

Conseil National des Droits de L'Homme du Royaume du Maroc, Institution Nationale de Promotion et de Protection des Droits de l'Homme

Points 2 et 3 de l'ordre du jour

Débat annuel sur les droits de l'homme des personnes handicapées

Monsieur le Président,

Le Conseil national des droits de l'Homme du Royaume du Maroc (CNDH) est honoré de prendre part à ce débat et exprime ses vifs compliments au HCDH pour la pertinence des recommandations de son étude sur le droit des personnes handicapées à l'éducation inclusive.

Au Maroc, en dépit des avancées de la Constitution de 2011 qui bannit toute discrimination sur la base du handicap et instaure l'obligation d'œuvrer pour mobiliser tous les moyens facilitant l'égal accès à une éducation accessible et de qualité, des lacunes persistent comme le non-respect du principe de la reconnaissance des capacités évolutives des enfants handicapés.

Le CNDH a signé des conventions de partenariat avec les Académies Régionales de l'Education et la Formation pour l'inclusion des droits de l'Homme dans le système d''enseignement. Aussi, plusieurs ateliers thématiques sur l'éducation inclusive ont été tenus notamment dans le cadre des deux dernières éditions du Salon international de l'édition et du livre de Casablanca. De plus, le CNDH a mené une étude dans les provinces du Sud sur l'accès des personnes handicapées à leurs droits qui converge avec les conclusions formulées dans l'étude du HCDH, particulièrement en matière d'accessibilité, d'encadrement pédagogique et d'accompagnement individualisé. Enfin, le CNDH publiera en octobre prochain une étude sur la politique publique relative à l'éducation inclusive.

Le CNDH réaffirme la nécessité d'adopter une approche inclusive basée sur le droit dans la politique publique éducative et s'engage à apporter son expertise en la matière.

Il recommande au gouvernement de fournir plus d'efforts, en vue d'adopter des mesures législatives et financières et de veiller à :

- La formation continue et le renforcement des capacités des différents acteurs en matière de communication alternative et augmentative ;
- L'intégration des outils de l'éducation inclusive dans la formation initiale et continue ;
- La prise en charge permettant de garantir l'accès de tous à l'école ;
- L'orientation, le soutien aux familles des personnes handicapées et le renforcement de leurs capacités d'accompagnements.

Je vous remercie de votre attention.

United Nations A/HRC/25/NI/17

General Assembly

Distr.: General
19 March 2014

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Twenty-fifth session
Agenda item 3
Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development

Information presented by the Greek Human Rights Commission*

Note by the Secretariat

The Secretariat of the Human Rights Council hereby transmits the communication submitted by the Greek Human Rights Commission**, reproduced below in accordance with rule 7(b) of the rules of procedures described in the annex to Council resolution 5/1, according to which participation of national human rights institutions is to be based on arrangements and practices agreed upon by the Commission on Human Rights, including resolution 2005/74 of 20 April 2005.

* National human rights institution with "A"-status accreditation from the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights.

** Reproduced in the annex as received, in the language of submission only.

GE.14-12158

1412158

Please recycle

Annex

[English only]

Information presented by the Hellenic Republic Greek National Commission for Human Rights

Comments on the Report of the Independent Expert on **the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights**, Dr. Cephas Lumina

The Greek National Commission for Human Rights (GNCHR) would like to express its warmest thanks to Dr. Cephas Lumina for the in-depth examination of the situation in Greece on the occasion of his fact finding-mission and for the fruitful and open discussion that he had with GNCHR representatives on that occasion. The GNCHR thanks particularly Dr. Lumina for referring to its Recommendation on "The imperative need to reverse the sharp decline in civil liberties and social rights".

His report presents a true picture of the situation and shows an excellent insight into the socioeconomic and political conditions prevailing in our country. It is very well documented, while his recommendations are very pertinent. Dr. Lumina's mandate is very useful to European countries and CoE and EU institutions, as it can help them in their efforts to find solutions to financial problems which do not undermine human rights, to the benefit of the EU and Europe as a whole.

Consequently, the GNCHR is asking EU countries to rethink their position towards Dr. Lumina's Mandate.

The GNCHR would suggest the following additions to the sources of Dr. Lumina's report:

1. The Report on the ILO High Level Mission to Greece (19-23 September 2011); the Reports of the ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR) to the International Labour Conferences (ILCs) of 2012, 2013 and 2014 on the application of several ILO Conventions by Greece and the compatibility of austerity measures with these Conventions; the Report of the ILO Committee on Freedom of Association to the ILC of 2013 on the compatibility of austerity measures with ILO Conventions Nos. 87 and 98 (Case 2820); the Report of the ILO Committee on the Application of Standards to the ILC of 2013 on the compatibility of austerity measures with ILO Convention No. 98.

2. The Decision of the European Committee for Social Rights on Complaint 65/2011 (the six other decisions are referred to).

3. The open letters sent to Mr. Barroso and Mr. Draghi by the European Network of National Human Rights Institutions (ENNHRI), which, together with their attachments, are on the website of the International Coordinating Committee for NHRIs: http://nhri.ohchr.org/EN/Regional/Europe/Pages/Regional-Documents.aspx and on the website of the Scottish Human Rights Commission, which is chairing the ENNHRI:

http://www.scottishhumanrights.com/international/eurochair.

4. Footnote 13, on page 7 should be complemented as follows: "It should be noted that all European Union institutions, including the European Council and the Council of the EU, the European Parliament, the European Commission and the European Central Bank, [...] The GNCHR hopes that Dr. Lumina's Report and the recommendations therein included will be duly taken into account by European policy-makers, so that the deepening crisis can be better coped with, while universal and European fundamental values and principles are fully respected and strengthened.

5. Indeed, as the GNCHR is constantly recalling, there is no way out of the socio-economic and political crisis which plagues Europe as a whole, nor any future forth Union, if fundamental civil liberties and social rights are not effectively guaranteed.

Athens, 10 March 2014.